



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,869	01/24/2001	Kosmas Karadimitriou	2937.1000-003	3172

21005 7590 10/16/2006

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.  
530 VIRGINIA ROAD  
P.O. BOX 9133  
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER

BASEHOAR, ADAM L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 10/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/768,869

Applicant(s)

KARADIMITRIOU ET AL.

Examiner

Adam L. Basehoar

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2178

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment filed 07/24/06 to the RCE filed 03/23/06.
2. Claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 16, and 17, have been Amended.
3. The rejection of claims 1-3, 6-9, 10-12, and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell-Falla et al (US-6,675,162 01/06/04) in view of Chakrabarti et al (US-6,389,436 05/14/02) have been withdrawn as necessitated by Amendment.
4. The rejection of claims 4-5 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell-Falla et al (US: 6,675,162 01/06/04) in view of Chakrabarti et al (US-6,389,436 05/14/02) in further view of Haug et al (US: 6,556,964 04/29/03) have been withdrawn as necessitated by Amendment.
5. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 10 are independent claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-3, 6-9, 10-12, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell-Falla et al (US-6,675,162 01/06/04) in view of Chakrabarti et al (US-6,389,436 05/14/02) in further view of van den Akker (US-6,415,250 07/02/02)(Hereafter Akker).

**-In regard to independent claims 1 and 10, Russell-Falla et al teach a method and apparatus for determining content type of a web page comprising:**

providing a predefined set of potential content types (categories of content)(column 2, lines 35-43);

for each potential content type (categories of content)(column 2, lines 35-43)(e.g. “pornographic”, “racist”, etc)(column 3, lines 39-43), preparing a distinguishing series of binary tests (column 2, lines 56-63; column 3, lines 39-57; column 4, lines 61-66)(i.e. testing each keyword or regular expression of the content against a database of keywords and regular expressions common to the content type for matching and weighting purposes), wherein at least one test determines whether a predefined piece of data or keyword appears in URLs (column 2, lines 5-9) of the subject Web page (column 2, lines 56-63; column 3, lines 23-57, column 4, lines 61-66: i.e. testing all of a web pages textual content which as appreciated by one skilled in the art would include the text in the URLs of the selected web page);

for each potential content type (categories of content)(column 2, lines 35-43)(e.g. “pornographic”, “racist”, etc)(column 3, lines 39-43), running the distinguishing series of tests (column 2, lines 56-63; column 3, lines 39-57; column 4, lines 61-66)(i.e. testing each keyword or regular expression against a database of keywords and regular expressions common to the content type for matching and weighting purposes) enabling quantitative evaluation of some contents of the selected web page being of the potential content type (column 2, lines 55-64);

mathematically combining the test results (column 3, lines 54-57); and

based on the results, assigning a probability (equivalent to the final rating of the page relative to the content category), for each potential content type, that shows the likelihood that some contents of that type exist on the selected web page (column 3, lines 2-6).

Russell-Falla et al do not teach wherein the distinguishing series of tests includes at least one or more non-binary tests. Chakrabarti et al teach a distinguishing series of tests to determine the potential content type of a web page (column 4, lines 5-15), wherein the distinguishing series of tests include non-binary tests (i.e. the test results in more than two possible outcomes)(column 6, lines 27-67; column 7, lines 1-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Russell-Falla et al to have run the additional non-binary tests as taught in Chakrabarti et al for determining the content type of web pages, because Chakrabarti et al teach that by utilizing in/out links of the web page with the hypertext classifier (Fig. 1: 110) the accuracy of classification goes up over those tests utilizing only local text/terms of the document to be classified (column 7, lines 34-59).

Russell-Falla et al do not specifically teach wherein at least one test was examining syntax or grammar. Akker teaches a test for classifying an incoming text, wherein the test includes probabilistic analysis of the inputted text which reflect morphological characteristics of natural languages (column 3, lines 4-9: “automatically identifying a language...of natural languages”), wherein the tests examine the syntax and grammar of the incoming text (column 3, lines 26-45; column 4, lines 59-67; column 5, lines 1-9)(Figs 2A-C & 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for one of the distinguishing series of tests of Russell-Falla to have analyzed to syntax or grammar of the text, because Akker teaches by analyzing the grammar or syntax of an incoming text to determine a

Art Unit: 2178

source language provides the benefits of being able to efficiently and automatically classify and store documents as well as automatically selecting appropriate linguistic tools for the documents (column 1, lines 13-27; column 5, lines 27-52).

**-In regard to dependent claims 2, 11, and 15,** Russell-Falla et al further teach wherein the set of potential content types could include web page articles/news with information about people (e.g. pornography, racism, terrorism) and other content (column 2, lines 10-23; column 3, lines 41-43).

**-In regard to dependent claims 3 and 12,** Russell-Falla et al further teach producing a respective confidence level (equivalent to the rating of the page relative to the content category) for each potential content type when at least some of the web page content was of that type (columns 2 & 3, lines 54-67 & 1-6).

**-In regard to dependent claims 6 and 16,** Russell-Falla et al further teach wherein the step of running the tests includes determining whether a predefined piece of data or keyword (“weighting list”) appears in the web page (column 2, lines 56-63).

**-In regard to dependent claims 7 and 17,** Russell-Falla et al further teach wherein the step of running the tests includes determining whether a predefined piece of data or keyword (“weighting list”) appears in the web page (column 2, lines 56-63).

**-In regard to dependent claims 8, 9, and 18,** Russell-Falla et al do not teach storing indications of the assigned probabilities (web page ratings) of each potential content type cross referenced with each respective web page in a database. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stored previously viewed web pages along with there respective ratings for content types local to the user, because it was well known in the art at the time of the invention that storing frequently view web pages with their ratings would significantly reduce the determination/processing time of the Russell-Falla et al system by eliminating undue identifying, analyzing, and calculating on identical web page requests. Thus a repeated request could render an appropriate web page more efficiently which would benefit Russell-Falla et al which teach that analyzing web pages could be difficult and time consuming (column 1, 38-43).

**-In regard to dependent claims 19 and 20,** Russell-Falla et al teaches wherein one of tests was determining the number of phrases that contain the keyword (column 2, lines 56-63; column 3, lines 39-57; column 4, lines 61-67; column 5, lines 1-22: i.e. the number of keywords from the selected web page that have a corresponding entry in the pre-existing database are placed in a weighted list and then summed together to determine a rating to be compared to a given threshold).

8. Claim 4-5 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell-Falla et al (US: 6,675,162 01/06/04) in view of Chakrabarti et al (US-6,389,436

Art Unit: 2178

05/14/02) in view of van den Akker (US-6,415,250 07/02/02) in further view of Haug et al (US: 6,556,964 04/29/03).

**-In regard to dependent claims 4 and 13,** Russell-Falla et al further teach wherein the test results utilize a neural network (column 4, lines 1-5). Russell-Falla et al do not teach wherein the combining of the test results includes using a Bayesian network. Haug et al teach wherein the application of a Bayesian network for statistical pattern recognition provides improved system performance with additional training of the network (column 3, lines 8-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, for the invention of Russell-Falla et al to have employed a Bayesian network as shown in Haug et al, to achieve the above mentioned improved system performance, because Russell-Falla et al do provide the needed training of the network (column 3, lines 58-67) which would be needed to increase the statistical recognition needed to support the Bayesian network.

**-In regard to dependent claims 5 and 14,** Russell-Falla et al further teach the step of training the neural network using a training set of web pages with respective known content types and collecting the statistics on the test results of the training web pages (column 3, lines 58-67).



***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

-While the Examiner agrees that the newly amended claims are not specifically taught or suggested by the Russell-Falla et al (US-6,675,162 01/06/04) and Chakrabarti et al (US-6,389,436 05/14/02) references, the Examiner does believe that the newly applied prior art teaches the newly presented claimed features. When considering a response to the applied rejection, the Examiner also wishes to point out that certain other prior art references cited, but not relied upon, appear to teach wherein the distinguishing series of tests could include the format or style of the analyzed documents. For example, please note the Shumeli et al (US-6,442,555 08-2002) and Mahoney et al (US-6,665,841 12-2003) references.

***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2178

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US-6,665,841	12-2003	Mahoney et al.
US-6,397,205	05-2002	Juola, Patrick
US-5,418,951	05-1995	Damashek, Marc
US-6,044,375	03-2000	Shmueli et al.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L. Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB

  
STEPHEN HONG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER